to delay the sale of property and the realization of the creditor's claim. Sections 17 and 18 of the Registration Act should be amended as in British India.

Mr. Garudachar of Shimoga.

(c) Discharge of incumbrances on property should be required to be compulsorily registered.

Reply of Government.—A Draft Regulation embodying all the amendments to the Registration Act is ready and under consideration.

Subject No. 52.

Notice of Civil attachments to Sub-Registrars.

Messrs. M. Venkatakrishnaiya, M. Anantarajaiya, N. Srikantaiya and C. Krishnaiengar of Mysore City Municipality.

Summary of discussion.—Notice of attachment by Civil Courts should be given to Sub-Registrars [Mr. C. Krishnamurti of Bangalore opposes this, and says it will simply necessitate another book being kept by Sub-Registrars].

Reply of Government.—This will be noted for consideration.

Subject No. 53.

Dayabhaga Suits.

Mr. Aruṇachalasastri of Chikballapur.

Summary of discussion.—Suits for a portion of property may be allowed to be admitted by Courts having jurisdiction over only such share as plaintiffs may have a claim to, instead of making them resort, as is now done, to Courts which have jurisdiction over the whole property. Parties have now to come a long way to the head-quarters of districts to file suits in the superior courts.

Reply of Government.—Noted for consideration.

Subject No. 54.

Sureties for attached property.

Messrs. M. Venkatakrishnaiya, M. Anantarajaiya, N. Srikantaiya and C. Krishnaiengar of Mysore City Municipality, B. Garudachar of Shimoga and C. Krishnamurti of Bangalore.

Summary of discussion.—Sureties for attached property often do not produce the property when called upon. A regular suit is needed. Provision may therefore be made to punish them criminally or to seize such property. For instance, cattle are attached, and left in the custody of the patel, who fails to produce them on the date of sale. The Amin reports that the sale cannot be proceeded with; and a regular suit is then ordered to be brought. This causes much inconvenience and hardship. There have been many instances of this.

Reply of Government.—Enquiry will be made as to whether such cases are of frequent occurrence and require a remedy.

Subject No. 55.

Changes in the territorial jurisdiction of Munsiffs.

Messrs. C. B. Gopala Rao of Kolar Municipality and Dasappa of Nelamangala.

Summary of discussion.—The present system of changing the territorial jurisdiction of Munsiffs' Courts without consulting the wishes and convenience of people is most prejudicial to the interests of the public. The Chief Court sometimes recommends changes on mere presumptions. It causes great hardship to people to have to resort to new places. The recent transfer of the Nelamangala Munsiff's Court to Dodballapur is instanced as having caused inconvenience to the people of Goribidnur Taluk.

Reply of Government.—Such changes are only ordered on the recommendation of the Chief Court. And the people likely to be affected are also consulted, of course, as far as possible. The particular complaint referred to will be enquired into.